

REMARKS

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

The Examiner stated that claims 1-10, 12-16, 18, 20, 23-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Garcia (US 2003/0007612).

Response

Applicant respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reasons stated below.

As stated in MPEP § 2131, “A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Applicants respectfully submit, as will be detailed below, that Garcia does not, either expressly or inherently, teach or suggest many limitations recited in the pending claims. For example, the limitation of evaluating at least one voice interaction with at least one automatic speech recognition component adapted to analyze the at least one voice interaction is not disclosed in Garcia’s paragraph 47:

[0047] Considering an example wherein an event is sourced from Internet 13, assume that customer 37c initiates an IP call (by mouse click) through server 35 to center 15 from a contact page hosted in server 35. At this point, IVR technology hosted in server 35, or some other on-line interaction function may prompt user 37c to indicate a preference from a series of options. If voice recognition is used, a choice is entered based on customer voice response, which must be enabled (firmware and software) at the customer end. In another embodiment, an online submission form (more common) may be used.

As can be seen, paragraph 47 merely describes a user verbally choosing an option and the system performing the option as opposed to the above noted limitation which claims evaluating a voice interaction between an agent and a client with at least one automatic speech recognition component that analyzes the voice interaction.

However, purely in the interest of expediting the prosecution of the instant invention, Applicant has amended the independent claims to substantially include the following limitations: determining whether the at least one agent has adequately followed the at least one script by

Appl. No. 10/673,679
Amdt. Dated 07/09/2008
Reply to Office action of 04/09/2008

dividing the voice interaction into viewable panel-level segments and comparing the panel-level segments to the automatic speech recognition analyzed voice interaction.

Support for such limitations, which are not taught or suggested by the cited art, can be found at least in pages 4, 9, and 11-12 of the instant invention. As such, Applicant believes that the independent claims, as well as the claims that depend from them, are in condition for allowance and respectfully request they be passed to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 9, 2008

By: /Raffi Gostanian/
Raffi Gostanian
Reg. No. 42,595
Tel: 972.849.1310

WEST CORPORATION



29129

PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

11808 Miracle Hills Drive
Omaha, Nebraska 68154
(402) 965-7077